

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 are pending in the present application. All of these claims stand rejected. By this amendment, claim 1 has been changed. Support for the added features of claim 1 may be found, for example, in the last paragraph of page 4 of the specification. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections of claims 1-3 in light of the following comments. Before starting these remarks, however, the Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner and Supervisory Patent Examiner Wiley for granting a personal interview with the Applicant's representative on August 1, 2003.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being unpatentable by Nelson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,812,857). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the following reasons.

The present Office Action asserts that Nelson discloses the claimed step of "automatically reconfiguring the physical hardware structure of the first computer." The Applicant respectfully disagrees and maintains that Nelson merely discloses a computer system 1 having a persistent memory area 9 that is configurable from a functional or software standpoint. No physical hardware reconfiguration is actually performed in the system of Nelson. The referenced description in Nelson of a switch (download select means 7) implemented either in hardware or software to enable the device to function either in a normal operating mode or a download mode is not tantamount to reconfiguring the physical hardware structure of the computer system 1 or the persistent memory area 9. (See col. 4, ll. 23-26). Rather, the download select means 7 is merely a toggle between two operating modes and is essentially unrelated to the physical hardware structure of the computer system 1. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that the present Office Action fails to establish that this element of claim 1 is actually taught or suggested by Nelson.

Furthermore, Nelson does not disclose the claimed feature of "loading first configuration data including a hardware portion and a software portion." Instead, Nelson merely teaches downloading of a code set 41 that is a software computer file (see col. 5, ll. 5-9 and col. 4, ll. 28-31) executable by a central processing unit 11. Thus, the system of Nelson does not require code for reconfiguring the physical hardware of the computer 1, namely the central processing unit 11, and the addition of a hardware portion to the code would be superfluous since the computer 1 of

Nelson has no need for nor could it use such data. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that Nelson does not teach or suggest the elements of claim 1.

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,012,088) in view of Tang et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,298,370). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the following reasons.

According to the present Office Action, Li putatively teaches all of the elements of claim 1 except for processing a first task with a first computer configured with first configuration data. Tang is asserted as teaching this missing element. The Office Action further asserts that it would be obvious to incorporate processing taught by Tang with the method of Li in order to reduce latency through multitasking. The Applicants respectfully disagree with the assertion that the combination of Li and Tang teaches or suggests all of the elements of claim 1. In particular, neither Li or Tang teaches an actual reconfiguration of a physical hardware structure of a computer. In Li, in particular, an Internet access device 100 is disclosed that is able to automatically configure itself for communication with the Internet using information contained in the configuration record. This configuration record, however, merely contains information such as customer domain name, customer LAN network IP address, the Internet access device IP address, the DHCP range, time zone and NTP servers for time configuration, IP addresses for forwarding name servers, PPP account log in and password information, web mirroring configuration information, and mail configuration information. (See col. 14, ll. 53-63). Thus, the "configuration" being accomplished in the Internet access device 100 of Li is merely to set up particular settings necessary for connecting the device to the Internet. Such "configuration" is not a physical hardware reconfiguration, but merely setting parameters via downloaded software to set up (or "configure") a device for Internet accessibility. Further, the system of Tang does not teach or suggest reconfiguring the physical hardware structure of a computer. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 would not be obvious over the combination of Li in view of Tang.

Moreover, neither Li nor Tang teaches or suggests configuration data that includes a hardware portion and a software portion as featured in claim 1. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that this element is also not taught or suggested by the combination of Li in view of Tang.

In light of the above comments, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable over the combination of Li and Tang and requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn, accordingly.

With respect to dependent claims 2 and 3, the Applicant submits that these claims are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1.

In light of the foregoing, the Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY 

Patrick B. Law

Reg. No. 41,549

P.O. Box 1135

Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135

Phone: (312) 781-6801

Dated: August 18, 2003